

## Remarks

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above referenced case on February 08, 2007, made final. Claims 1-40 are standing for examination. Claims 1-40 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14-22, 24-32, and 34-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sehr (U.S. 6,386,451) hereinafter Sehr. The Examiner has not addressed claims 3, 13, 23 and 33 in the present Office Action.

Applicant has carefully studied the prior art references provided by the Examiner, and the Examiner's rejections and statements. In response, claims 1-40 are herein canceled. Applicant herein provides newly written claims 41-67 to overcome the 112 rejection and more particularly point out the subject matter deemed patentable by Applicant.

Applicant's newly written claims clearly recite providing information and services to customers from a Web-site at a first enterprise wherein the information and services are filtered or offered based upon identifying the origination of the customer request as directly from the customer or via a Web site from a second enterprise.

Applicant points out that the reference of Sehr teaches issuing travel cards to users to be physically presented to service providers. In some cases the card information, along with the user ID is presented to a service provider Web site to access services for the customer from a computer or computer based station.

Applicant argues that the services are specifically provided based on the card information and the user identification, *not* based on the origination of the request, as claimed. In applicant's invention intermediary Web sites subscribe to PI provider Web sites to access information for clients/users. The services are provided based on the Web

site's characteristics accessing the information, not only the ID/subscription information of the user. All services in Sehr are limited to the card information and the ID of the card holder. The card holder may use a "station" to access travel services in Sehr, but the services are not discriminated based on characteristics of the accessing Web site, as claimed.

For the above reasons, applicant believes that the newly written claims, as argued above, are clearly and unarguably patentable over the art presented by the Examiner and the 112 rejection. The dependent claims, although not addressed in the Office Letter are patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

As all of the claims have been shown to be patentable over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, and that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this response, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Gregg Freishtat et al.

By /Donald R. Boys/  
Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency, Inc.  
3 Hangar Way, Suite D  
Watsonville, CA 95076  
831-768-1755